

From: Bacalan, Vince [Bacalan.Vince@epa.gov]
Sent: 4/24/2019 3:12:50 PM
To: Yelensky, Erica [Yelensky.Erica@epa.gov]; Jennifer Hecker [JHecker@chnep.org]; DCRoomWest7324/DC-CCW-OWOW [DCRoomWest7324@epa.gov]
Subject: Santa Monica Review Team discussion of PE findings
Start: 4/24/2019 6:00:00 PM
End: 4/24/2019 8:00:00 PM
Show Time As: Tentative

Conference Line/Code / Ex. 6

I. 2014 challenges: Have they addressed...

- a. Financial Management?
- b. Outreach and Public Involvement?
 - i. SMBNEP roles and responsibilities
 - ii. Effectiveness of the WAC
 - iii. Communication to stakeholders and encourage public involvement
 - 1. Suggestion: webcasting as an option for greater public involvement/participation
- c. Performance Measures (Met Fully Performing)?
- d. Workplan Elements?

II. Perceived Strengths

- a. Competent and well-managed staff to help implement CCMP
- b. Staff engages stakeholders and manages to keep information publicly available
- c. Governing Board is a diverse representation of the study area and amplifies the work throughout
- d. Diverse partnership allowing for stronger financial stability and sustainability
- e. Research projects have strong scientific basis. Data and results are disseminated via conferences and publications.
- f. Leader in trash reduction; stormwater projects; public trainings; and community involvement for habitat restoration (kelp forests)

III. Perceived Challenges

- a. WAC meetings may not be as productive and a friendly environment
 - i. Suggestions: develop rules of engagement for meetings; hire meeting facilitator
- b. Autonomy as an independent entity
 - i. Suggestions: one dedicated website; unified logo; clear roles of staff and responsibilities to support the NEP; governance structure diagram; develop by-laws, succession plans, operating procedures, code of ethics similar to other NEPs.
- c. Developing an economic/environmental valuation of its resources

IV. Other opportunities, further documentation, questions to staff

- a. Staff breakdown supported by 320 versus leveraged/in-kind support (p6, Narrative)
- b. Missing 2 items from Assessment and Monitoring piece (p26, Measures)
- c. Web-based GIS data display for more timely reporting of conditions (p28, Measures)
- d. Is the CMP vetted through the TAC first before approved by the GB? (p29, Measures)
- e. Existing Finance and Monitoring Plan utilized during the review period?
- f. Was monitoring after the Arroyo Sequit Fish Passage project determined that this was a successful effort? (p41, Narrative)

g. Preliminary 'grade' for SMBNEP

V. Site visit

- a. Which projects should we consider visiting?
- b. How long the visit should be?
- c. What HQ management can offer if attending?